UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,398	09/08/2008	Klaus B. Himmeldirk	27211/04219	1409
	7590 09/11/200 ΓER & GRISWOLD, Ι	EXAMINER		
800 SUPERIOR		LEWIS, PATRICK T		
SUITE 1400 CLEVELAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1623	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipdocket@calfee.com dcunin@calfee.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/597,398	HIMMELDIRK ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Patrick T. Lewis	1623			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	-· action is non-final.				
<i>;</i> —	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
·		3.3.2.3.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>7/24/2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		, , , ,			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents		on No.			
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)					
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Taper No(s)/Mail Date  Notice of Informal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/597,398 Page 2

Art Unit: 1623

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

The terms "precursor" and "analogue" render the claims in which they appear indefinite. In the absence of the specific derivatizations to the chemical core claimed or distinct language to describe the structural modifications or the chemical names of the derivatized chemical core claimed of this invention, the identity of the instant analogues and/or precursors would be difficult to describe and the metes and bounds of said analogues and/or precursors applicant regards as the invention cannot be sufficiently determined because they have not been particularly pointed out or distinctly articulated in the claims.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 3

- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 6. Claims 1-9, 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khanbabaee et al. Tetrahedron (1997), Vol. 53, pages 10725-10732 (Khanbabaee).

Khanbabaee teaches that a mixture of  $\alpha,\beta$ -glucopyranose 11 was allowed to react with the benzylated gallic acid 5 in the presence of DMAP and DCC to afford the  $\beta$ -anomer 9 in 42% yield and the  $\alpha$ -anomer 12 in 33% yield (Scheme 3). The anomers 9 and 12 were easily separated by column chromatography on silica gel. Subsequent debenzylation of the  $\alpha$ -anomer 12 gave the unnatural  $\alpha$ -acylglycoside 13 and

Experimental Section.

Khanbabaee differs form the instantly claimed invention in that Khanbabaee teaches refluxing the reaction mixture in DCM versus conducting the reaction at room temperature; however, generally differences in temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

#### Conclusion

7. Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1-23 are rejected. No claims are allowed.

#### Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick T. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-0655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10 am to 3 pm (Maxi Flex).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia A. Jiang can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrick T. Lewis/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1623

/PL/